Quantum fluctuation theorem and a sharpened Holevo's bound

Dvir Kafri[1] and Sebastian Deffner[2]

[1] Joint Quantum Institute, Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA
[2] Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

arXiv:1207.2978v1 [quant-ph] 12 Jul 2012

PACS 05.30.-d – Quantum statistical mechanics
PACS 05.40.-a – Fluctuation phenomena in statistical physics
PACS 89.70.Kn – Channel capacity in information theory

Abstract – We derive a general quantum fluctuation theorem that explicitly accounts for the back action of quantum measurements on reduced systems. This theorem encompasses most thermodynamically relevant fluctuation theorems based on two-time measurements. As specific examples, we analyze the quantum Jarzynski equality for non-unitary dynamics and derive a fluctuation theorem for systems undergoing thermal changes. In addition, we show how a sharpened Holevo's bound follows as a consequence of our new general theorem.

Thermodynamics and information theory are intimately connected. The most prominent evidence for this relationship is that the Clausius entropy [1] is given by the Shannon information [2] in systems at thermal equilibrium [3]. In particular, Landauer's principle [4,5] illustrates that information is a physical, measurable quantity. Thermodynamic work has to be performed in order to create or erase information. Landauer's principle can therefore be understood as a statement of the second law of thermodynamics in an information theoretic context. This is also true for Holevo's bound [6], which limits the amount of classical information that can be encoded in a generic quantum system. Recently, nano-devices - for which these principles are directly applicable - have become experimentally accessible [7]. These controlled quantum systems have applications ranging from quantum simulation [8,9], cryptography [10], computing [11–13], to metrology [14–17]. The main obstacles towards realization of such devices are control noise and interactions with the environment, so a thermodynamic study is necessary to fully understand their information theoretic properties. However, most nano-devices operate far from thermal equilibrium, so tools from non-equilibrium statistical physics are required. In recent years, formulations of the second law have been derived which are valid arbitrarily far from equilibrium. These so-called fluctuation theorems, in particular the Jarzynski equality [18], enable the calculation of equilibrium quantities from non-equilibrium averages over many realizations of a single process. They also encompass non-equilibrium, information theoretic generalizations of the second law. As Landauer's principle is a direct implication of these theorems [19], one may ask whether Holevo's bound is also such a result. One complication in this case is that the approach to fluctuation theorems for quantum systems is mathematically and conceptually more involved. Thermodynamic quantities, which are not given as state functions, cannot be assigned an Hermitian operator [20]. The proper formulation of quantum thermodynamics for non-equilibrium systems, especially quantum fluctuation theorems [21], must therefore be treated with care.

The purpose of the present note is twofold. In the first part we derive a general quantum fluctuation theorem that accounts for the back action of measurements on reduced systems (see [22] for a similar approach). To this end, we consider an experimental point of view; we assume that the system of interest is coupled to an environment which is experimentally inaccessible. Such measurements on open quantum systems are inherently incomplete, since they ignore environmental degrees of freedom. Information is *lost* that in principle could have been acquired by concurrent measurement of the reservoir. A general formulation of quantum fluctuation theorems must explicitly account for these effects. The integral fluctuation theorem we derive is applicable to arbitrary orthogonal measurements, for systems undergoing both unitary and non-unitary dynamics. We show that this result encompasses several integral quantum fluctuation theorems, and in particular derive the quantum generalization of the fluctuation theorem for thermal work [23].

In the second part we focus on an information theoretic consequence of the fluctuation theorem, a sharpened statement of Holevo's bound. Our derivation thereby illustrates a notable connection between quantum thermodynamics and quantum information theory.

General quantum fluctuation theorem. – Consider a time-dependent quantum system, $\mathcal{S}$, with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}$ and initial density matrix $\rho_{t=0} = \rho_0$. Information about the state of the system is obtained by performing measurements on $\mathcal{S}$ at the beginning and end of a specific process. At $t = 0$ a quantum measurement is made of observable A^i, with eigenvalues a^i_m. Letting Π^i_m denote the orthogonal projectors into the eigenspaces of A^i, we have $A^\mathrm{i} = \sum_m a^\mathrm{i}_m \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m$. Note that the eigenvalues $\{a^\mathrm{i}_m\}$ can be degenerate, so the projectors $\{\Pi^\mathrm{i}_m\}$ may have rank greater than one. Unlike the classical case, as long as ρ_0 and A^i do not have a common set of eigenvectors - i.e. they do not commute - performing a measurement on $\mathcal{S}$ alters its statistics. Measuring a^i_m maps ρ_0 to the state $\Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \rho_0 \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m / p_m$, where $p_m = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \rho_0 \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m\right\}$ is the probability of the measurement outcome a^i_m. Generally accounting for all possible measurement outcomes, the statistics of $\mathcal{S}$ after the measurement are given by the weighted average of all projections,

$$M^\mathrm{i}(\rho_0) = \sum_m \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \, \rho_0 \, \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \,. \tag{1}$$

If ρ_0 commutes with A^i, it commutes with each Π^i_m, so $M^\mathrm{i}(\rho_0) = \sum_m \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \rho = \rho_0$ and the statistics of the system are unaltered by performing the measurement. After measuring a^i_m, $\mathcal{S}$ undergoes a generic time evolution over time τ, after which it is given by $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \rho_0 \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m)/p_m$. Here $\mathbb{E}_\tau$ represent any linear (unitary or non-unitary) quantum transformation, which is trace-preserving and maps non-negative operators to non-negative operators. Further, we require that this holds whenever $\mathbb{E}_\tau$ is extended to an operation $\mathbb{E}_\tau \otimes \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{E}$ ($\mathbb{I}_\mathcal{E}$ being the identity map on $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E}$) on any enlarged Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E}$. Such a transformation is called a trace-preserving, completely positive (TCP) map [24]. At time $t = \tau$ a measurement of a second (not necessarily the same) observable, $A^\mathrm{f} = \sum_n a^\mathrm{f}_n \Pi^\mathrm{f}_n$, is performed on $\mathcal{S}$. The probability of measuring a^f_n, conditioned on having first measured a^i_m, is $p_{n|m} = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\Pi^\mathrm{f}_n \, \mathbb{E}_\tau\left(\Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \rho_0 \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m\right)\right\}/p_m$. Accordingly, the joint probability distribution $p_{m\rightarrow n}$ reads

$$p_{m\rightarrow n} = p_m \cdot p_{n|m} = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\Pi^\mathrm{f}_n \, \mathbb{E}_\tau\left(\Pi^\mathrm{i}_m \rho_0 \Pi^\mathrm{i}_m\right)\right\} \,. \tag{2}$$

We are interested in the probability distribution of possible measurement outcomes, $\mathcal{P}\left(\Delta a\right) = \left\langle \delta\left(\Delta a - \Delta a_{n,m}\right)\right\rangle$, where $\Delta a_{n,m} = a^\mathrm{f}_n - a^\mathrm{i}_m$ is a random variable determined in a single measurement run. Its probability distribution is given by averaging over all possible realizations,

$$\mathcal{P}\left(\Delta a\right) = \sum_{m,n} \delta\left(\Delta a - \Delta a_{n,m}\right) \, p_{m\rightarrow n} \,. \tag{3}$$

To derive the integral fluctuation theorem we follow the standard approach and compute its characteristic function, $\mathcal{G}(s)$, which is the Fourier transform of $\mathcal{P}(\Delta a)$ [21]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(s) &= \int \mathrm{d}(\Delta a) \, \mathcal{P}(\Delta a) \, \exp\left(is \, \Delta a\right) \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(isA^\mathrm{f}\right) \mathbb{E}_\tau\left(M^\mathrm{i}(\rho_0) \exp\left(-isA^\mathrm{i}\right)\right)\right\} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Choosing $s = i$, we obtain the general quantum fluctuation theorem

$$\left\langle \exp\left(-\Delta a\right)\right\rangle = \gamma \,. \tag{5}$$

The quantity γ accounts for the information *lost* by not measuring the environment. It plays a crucial role in the following discussion and is given explicitly by

$$\gamma = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-A^\mathrm{f}\right) \mathbb{E}_\tau\left(M^\mathrm{i}(\rho_0) \exp\left(A^\mathrm{i}\right)\right)\right\} \,. \tag{6}$$

Similar fluctuation theorems of the form $\langle \exp\left(-\Sigma\right)\rangle = \gamma_\mathrm{cl}$ have been derived in the context of classical feedback processes, where Σ is an entropy production. For these the right hand side, γ_cl, is commonly called the (classical) efficacy of the feedback protocol [25]. In the present context γ can then be interpreted as a quantum efficacy corresponding to the observables A^i and A^f, and the TCP map $\mathbb{E}_\tau$. Note that γ only takes the from of the classical efficacy, γ_cl, and usually may not be regarded as its physical quantum analogue [26]. For an optimal choice of initial and final measurement, $\gamma = 1$. These special measurements can be interpreted as optimally designed observables corresponding to the TCP map $\mathbb{E}_\tau$, such that the fluctuation theorem reduces to the classical form without any quantum corrections.

A complementary result relevant to the fluctuation theorem is Jensen's Inequality, which states that for any convex function ϕ and random variable x, $\langle \phi(x)\rangle \geq \phi(\langle x\rangle)$ [27]. Applying this to Eq. (5) yields

$$\langle \Delta a\rangle \geq -\log\left(\gamma\right) . \tag{7}$$

For specific choices of thermodynamically relevant observables A^i and A^f, this relation can be understood as a generalized formulation of the Clausius inequality.

Quantum corrections to classical theorems. – As an illustrative example, let us turn to the generalization of the quantum Jarzynski equality to generically open quantum systems,

$$\left\langle \exp\left(-\beta W\right)\right\rangle = \exp\left(-\beta \Delta F\right) , \tag{8}$$

where W is the work done on the system and ΔF the change in initial and final equilibrium free energy. We consider a bipartite quantum system that can be separated into a time-dependent system of interest, $\mathcal{S}$, and a thermal environment, $\mathcal{B}$, with inverse temperature β. The total Hamiltonian for $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$H_\mathrm{tot}(t) = H_\mathcal{S}(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{B} + \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S} \otimes H_B + h_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B}} \,, \tag{9}$$

where $h_{\mathcal{SB}}$ denotes an interaction between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Further, we assume that $H_{\mathcal{S}}(t<0) \equiv H_{\mathcal{S}}(0)$, so at $t=0$ the total system will have relaxed to its thermodynamic equilibrium state, $\rho_0 = \exp\left(-\beta H_{\mathrm{tot}}(0)\right)/Z_0$, where $Z_0 = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-\beta H_{\mathrm{tot}}(0)\right)\right\}$ is the partition function for the composite system. It is worth emphasizing that although the total system is in a Gibbs state, the reduced state is generally not, $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}\left\{\rho_0\right\} \neq \exp\left(-\beta H_{\mathcal{S}}(0)\right)/Z_{\mathcal{S}}(0)$ [28].

Unlike the classical case [29], if only *partial* information (through measurement of $\mathcal{S}$) is available, Eq. (8) is not strictly valid, though it can be corrected by making a concurrent measurement of the environment [30]. The present treatment proposes a generically valid scheme to determine quantum corrections to the classical result, which for open systems have only been properly treated in specific cases [31]. Usually it is assumed that the system Hamiltonian is parametrized by an external control parameter α_t, so the work performed on the system is $W = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\int_0^\tau \mathrm{d}t\, \dot{\alpha}_t \frac{\partial H_S}{\partial \alpha_t} \rho_t\right\}$. However, work is not a quantum observable, and is thus usually defined through an initial and final energy measurement [20,32,33]. We therefore consider $\Delta a_{n,m} = \beta(E_n^\tau - E_m^0)$, where E_n^τ, E_m^0 are the measured energy eigenvalues of $H_{\mathcal{S}}(\tau)$ and $H_{\mathcal{S}}(0)$, respectively. Accordingly, we have $A^{\mathrm{i}} = \beta H_{\mathcal{S}}(0) \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $A^{\mathrm{f}} = \beta H_{\mathcal{S}}(\tau) \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$. Note that for generically open systems such measurements only determine the change of internal energy, ΔE. A distinction of work, W, and heat, Q, only becomes feasible if additional information about the microscopic dynamics is accessible [3]. We therefore formulate the quantum analogue of Eq. (8) in terms of ΔE.

The quantum efficacy γ (6) for this protocol reads

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &= \exp\left(-\beta\, \Delta F\right) \\ &\quad\times \mathrm{tr}\left\{\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(\tau) \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right] \mathbb{E}_\tau\left(M^{\mathrm{i}}(\rho_0)\ \left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)^{-1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right]\right)\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(t) = \exp\left(-\beta H_{\mathcal{S}}(t)\right)/Z_{\mathcal{S}}(t)$ is the Gibbsian of the isolated system, and $\beta\Delta F = -\log(Z_{\mathcal{S}}(\tau)/Z_{\mathcal{S}}(0))$ its associated change in equilibrium free energy. The TCP map $\mathbb{E}_\tau$ is given by the unitary evolution of the total system, $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\cdot) = U_{\tau,0} \cdot U_{\tau,0}^\dagger$, with $U_{\tau,0} = \mathcal{T}_> \int_0^\tau \mathrm{d}t\, H_{\mathrm{tot}}(t)$. Thus, as a consequence of Eq. (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \exp\left(-\beta(\Delta E - \Delta F)\right)\right\rangle = \\ &\mathrm{tr}\left\{\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(\tau) \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right] U_{\tau,0}\, M^{\mathrm{i}}(\rho_0)\ \left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)^{-1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right]\ U_{\tau,0}^\dagger\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the quantity $\beta(\Delta E - \Delta F)$ is recognized as the change in the thermodynamic entropy of the system. In the thermally isolated limit, $Q=0$, this expression reduces to $\beta\left(W - \Delta F\right)$ found in Eq. (8).

To analyze when Eq. (11) reduces to its classical form, we write $M^{\mathrm{i}}(\rho_0)\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)^{-1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right] = (\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{S}} + \chi_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}}(0)$, where $\rho_B(0) = \mathrm{tr}_S\left\{\rho_0\right\}$ and χ_S is a correction term governed by $h_{\mathcal{SB}}$ [28]. Then Eq. (11) can be written as

$$\left\langle \exp\left(-\beta(\Delta E - \Delta F)\right)\right\rangle = 1 + \epsilon, \tag{12}$$

where ϵ is the quantum correction term to the classical *form* of the Jarzynski equality. It reads explicitly

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &= \mathrm{tr}\left\{\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(\tau) \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right] U_{\tau,0}\ \left[\left[\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \rho_B(0)\right], U_{\tau,0}^\dagger\right]\right\} \\ &\quad+ \mathrm{tr}\left\{\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(\tau) \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\right] U_{\tau,0}\left[\chi_S \otimes \rho_B(0)\right] U_{\tau,0}^\dagger\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

When the interaction term $h_{\mathcal{SB}}$ is sufficiently small, $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}\left\{\rho_0\right\} \simeq \rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)$ [28], and we have $\chi_{\mathcal{S}} \simeq 0$. Likewise in this limit $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(0) \propto \exp\left(-\beta H_{\mathcal{B}}\right)$, which commutes with $U_{\tau,0}^\dagger \simeq \left(U_{\tau,0}^{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \exp\left(-iH_{\mathcal{B}}\tau\right)\right)^\dagger$. Hence both terms contributing to ϵ vanish whenever the contribution of the interaction term can be neglected. This is the case for ultra-weak coupling or in the high temperature limit (see also [31] for an analysis in the context of Quantum Brownian Motion).

For situations in which only a subsystem of the total quantum system is accessible, Eq. (13) yields an explicit formula for the quantum corrections to the classical form of the Jarzynski equality. To calculate these corrections perturbatively in $h_{\mathcal{SB}}$, one may use Suzuki's relation [34]

$$\partial_\lambda V(t) = V(t) \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\, V(s)^{-1}\, \partial_\lambda A(s)\, V(s), \tag{14}$$

where $V(t)$ is an operator satisfying $V(0) = \mathbb{I}$, $\partial_t V = A(t)V(t)$ and λ is an expansion parameter. This is done by applying Eq. (14) to $\exp(-\beta(H_{\mathrm{tot}}(0)))$ and $U_{\tau,0}$, with λ corresponding to the operator norm $||h_{\mathcal{SB}}||$.

Fluctuation theorem for thermal changes. – By appropriate choice of initial and final observables A^{i} and A^{f}, Eq. (5) reproduces several known quantum fluctuation theorems [20–22,32,35–38]. As a new contribution, we consider a quantum system consisting of a system of interest and an environment with time-dependent temperature. For classical, deterministic systems this situation was considered in [23,39]. To derive the quantum generalization of the fluctuation theorem proposed in [23], the corresponding observables A^{i} and A^{f} need to be identified. In the classical treatment one considers a *generalized entropy*, ΔX, given by

$$\Delta X(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_\tau) = \log\left(P^{\mathrm{i}}(\Gamma_0)\right) - \log\left(P^{\mathrm{f}}(\Gamma_\tau)\right). \tag{15}$$

$P^{\mathrm{i}}(\Gamma)$ represents the initial distribution of the system of interest, defined over phase space parameter Γ, while $P^{\mathrm{f}}(\Gamma)$ is an arbitrarily chosen distribution, cf. [40]. For a given phase space trajectory Γ_t, ΔX is only determined by its initial and final values, which directly enables the definition of its quantum analogue. Accordingly, we choose the pair of observables $A^{\mathrm{i}} = -\log(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0))$ and $A^{\mathrm{f}} = -\log(\sigma)$, where $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}\left\{\rho_0\right\}$ is the initial distribution of the reduced system, and σ is a final density matrix analogous to $P^{\mathrm{f}}(\Gamma)$. The dynamics of the composite system are unitary, described by the time-dependent Hamiltonian $H_{\mathrm{tot}}(t)$. It is instructive to assume that

$H_{\rm tot}(t) = H_\mathcal{S} + H_\mathcal{B}(t) + h_\mathcal{SB}$. Moreover, we assume that the total system is initially prepared in a product state, $\rho(0) = \rho_\mathcal{S}(0) \otimes \rho_\mathcal{B}(0)$. This assumption is not restrictive as we initially perform a measurement on $\mathcal{S}$, thereby disentangling $\mathcal{S}$ from $\mathcal{B}$. The TCP map describing the time evolution of $\mathcal{S}$ is given by tracing out the environment, $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\rho_S) = \mathrm{tr}_\mathrm{B}\left\{U_{\tau,0}\left[\rho_\mathcal{S}\otimes\rho_\mathcal{B}(0)\right]U^\dagger_{\tau,0}\right\}$, where $U_{\tau,0}$ is the time evolution operator associated with $H_{\rm tot}(t)$. Equation (5) takes the form

$$\langle \exp\left(-\Delta X\right)\rangle = \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\sigma\, \mathbb{E}_\tau(\hat{P}_0)\right\}\,, \tag{16}$$

where $\hat{P}_0$ is the projector into the support of $\rho_\mathcal{S}(0)$. We proceed by identifying $h_\mathcal{SB}$ as an interaction between $\mathcal{S}$ and only a subset of the degrees of freedom in the bath, $\mathcal{B}$. That is, we assume that the bath Hilbert space can be decomposed into two components, $\mathcal{H}'_\mathcal{B}\otimes\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{U}$, where $\mathcal{H}'_\mathcal{B}$ describes the degrees of freedom in direct contact with the system, while $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{U}$ is the rest of the universe. This separation becomes mathematically necessary in order to properly describe the physical setup. While $\mathcal{H}'_\mathcal{B}$ is a thermal bath, assumed to always be in a Gibbsian $\rho_{\mathcal{B}'} \propto \exp\left(\beta_t H_{\mathcal{B}'}\right)$, there is an *external agent* living in $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{U}$ and varying the temperature of $\mathcal{B}'$. If the interaction term $h_\mathcal{SB}$ is small, we have $\rho_\mathcal{S}(0) \simeq \exp\left(-\beta_0 H_\mathcal{S}\right)/Z_\mathcal{S}(0)$, with $Z_\mathcal{S}(0) = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-\beta_0 H_\mathcal{S}\right)\right\}$. Over time τ, the inverse temperature of the bath, β_t, is varied from β_0 to β_τ according to some external protocol. Since H_S is time-independent, changes in the system's energy are identified with thermal work [23, 39]. The quantum fluctuation theorem is obtained by choosing $A^\mathrm{f} = -\log(\sigma)$, where $\sigma = \exp(-\beta_\tau H_\mathcal{S})/Z_\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ and $Z_\tau = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-\beta_\tau H_\mathcal{S}\right)\right\}$. Accordingly, the thermal work is defined as $\Delta X = \beta_t(E_t - F_t)|_0^\tau$ and we have

$$\langle \exp\left(-\Delta X\right)\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-\beta_\tau H_\mathcal{S}\right)/Z_\mathcal{S}(\tau)\, \mathbb{E}_\tau(\mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S})\right\}\,. \tag{17}$$

As in the case of the Jarzynski equality, the non-unitary dynamics of the reduced subsystem lead to quantum corrections to the classical form. In Eq. (17) they are fully determined by the TCP map $\mathbb{E}_\tau$ acting on the identity in the reduced system, $\mathcal{S}$. The classical limit is recovered with the help of the Born approximation, $\rho(t) \simeq \rho_\mathcal{S}(t)\otimes\rho_\mathcal{B}(t)$. Within this limit it turns out that the solution of the master equation $i\dot\rho(t) = [H(t), \rho(t)]$ satisfies $i\dot\rho_\mathcal{S}(t) \simeq [H_\mathcal{S} + h^{\rm eff}(t), \rho_\mathcal{S}(t)]$, with $h^{\rm eff}(t) = \mathrm{tr}_\mathcal{B}\left\{h_\mathcal{SB}\left[\mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}\otimes\rho_\mathcal{B}(t)\right]\right\}$. Since $h^{\rm eff}(t)$ is Hermitian [41], $\rho_\mathcal{S}(t)$ is the solution of a master equation describing unitary dynamics, so that $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}) = \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}$. The right hand side of Eq. (17) reduces to unity in the Born approximation, and therefore the classical form is recovered in the weak coupling limit.

Unital maps and the quantum efficacy. – Let us consider general conditions for which $\gamma = 1$ in Eq. (16). For the sake of simplicity, assume $\rho_\mathcal{S}(0)$ is full rank, so that $\hat{P}_0 = \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}$. In this case we have $\gamma = 1$ for all TCP maps satisfying $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}) = \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}$. Such maps are called *unital* quantum channels. The simplest unital channel is unitary evolution, $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\cdot) = U\cdot U^\dagger$, where U is a unitary operator. In fact, the unital channels are the set of affine combination of unitary channels, $\{\sum_k \pi_k U_k\cdot U_k^\dagger : \sum\pi_k = 1, \pi_k\in\mathbb{R}\}$ [42]. In the case of Hamiltonian evolution of a composite system, if $[H(t), \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{S}\otimes\rho_\mathcal{B}(0)] = 0$ for all t then $\mathbb{E}_\tau$ is unital. Such an evolution implies an interaction with no heat exchange, even though $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ may become correlated. Finally, we note that the choice of $\rho_\mathcal{S}(0)$ and σ in the definition of ΔX is *incidental*, in that $\langle\exp\left(-\Delta X\right)\rangle = 1$ holds irrespective of their choice. This is similar to Seifert's fluctuation theorem for stochastic systems [40, 43].

Sharpened Holevo's theorem. – The rest of the present note provides an example of how tools from quantum thermodynamics may benefit quantum information theory. Specifically, we use the general quantum fluctuation theorem (5) to derive a sharpened version of Holevo's bound. This bound sets a limit on how much classical information can be sent through a (noisy) quantum channel. Let us consider a message composed of code words w_j that appear with probability π_j. A messenger (Alice) attempts to transfer this message to a receiver (Bob) by encoding each word w_j in a quantum state and transmitting that state to Bob. We assume that Bob receives the state ρ_j, which may have come through a lossy medium and therefore be different from the original state prepared by Alice. Bob attempts to infer the word w_j from the encoding by making a generalized measurement of the state ρ_j. This corresponds to introducing a probe, initially in a pure state $|0\rangle$, and making an orthogonal measurement on the compound state $\rho_j\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|$ [44]. If $\{\Pi_k\}$ represents the set of orthogonal projectors corresponding to Bob's measurement, the probability of measuring Π_k, given message w_j, is given by

$$\pi_{k|j} = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_j\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|\Pi_k\right\} = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_j M_k\right\}\,, \tag{18}$$

where $M_k = \langle 0|\Pi_k|0\rangle$ are operators acting only on the encoding degree of freedom. Although the M_k are non-negative and $\sum_k M_k = \mathbb{I}$, generally they are not projectors, $M_k^2 \neq M_k$. Such a collection $\{M_k\}$ is called a positive operator valued measure (POVM), and describes the most general measurement on a quantum system. The classical message distribution $\{\pi_j\}$, output quantum encoding $\{\rho_j\}$, and POVM elements $\{M_k\}$ define a classical-quantum channel [45].

A proper measure of how well Bob decodes Alice's message is the mutual information between the message and measurement distributions, $I = \sum_{jk}\pi_j\,\pi_{k|j}\,\log\left(\pi_{k|j}/\pi_k\right)$, where $\pi_k = \sum_j \pi_j\,\pi_{k|j}$ is the overall probability of measuring Π_k. Note that $I = \sum_j \pi_j D(\pi_{k|j}||\pi_k)$, where $D(\pi_{k|j}||\pi_k) = \sum_k \pi_{k|j}\log\left(\pi_{k|j}/\pi_k\right)$ is the (classical) relative entropy [46]. Hence I is a sum of non-negative terms and is 0 if and only if $\pi_{k|j} = \pi_k$ for all k, j. That is, I vanishes only if all outcomes of the measurement are independent of the encoded word, so that Bob always learns nothing about the message.

The probability of the message being w_j, conditioned on Bob measuring Π_k is, $\pi_{j|k} = \pi_{k|j}\,\pi_j/\pi_k$. We have

$$I = S(\{\pi_j\}) + \sum_k \pi_k \sum_j \pi_{j|k} \log \pi_{j|k}, \tag{19}$$

where $S(\{\pi_j\}) = -\sum_j \pi_j \log \pi_j$ is the Shannon information of distribution $\{\pi_j\}$. Since $x\log(x) \leq 0$ for $|x| \leq 1$, with equality only for $x = 0$ and $x = 1$, we observe that $I \leq S(\{\pi_j\})$, with equality if and only if $\pi_{j|k}$ is 0 or 1 for all j, k. In other words, the mutual information I is thus at most $S(\{\pi_j\})$, with equality if and only if Bob correctly decodes the message in every instance. If Alice's encoded states are not perfectly distinguishable (that is, if $\mathrm{supp}(\rho_j)$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\rho_{j'})$ are not orthogonal spaces for some $j \neq j'$), then I can never equal $S(\{\pi_j\})$, no matter what measurement Bob chooses to make. Holevo's theorem is then an upper bound for I, namely

$$\chi \equiv S(\bar{\rho}) - \sum_j \pi_j \cdot S(\rho_j) \geq I, \tag{20}$$

where $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{tr}\{\rho \log \rho\}$ is the von-Neumann entropy, and $\bar{\rho} = \sum_j \pi_j \rho_j$ is the density matrix describing the statistics of the encoding given no knowledge of the message word. Heuristically, χ can be considered as the uncertainty of the encoding with no knowledge of the message, minus the average remaining uncertainty given knowledge of the message. Note that if the encoded states are distinguishable, i.e. $\rho_j \rho_{j'} = \mathbb{O}$ for all $j \neq j'$, then $\chi = S(\{\pi_j\})$, so that with a proper measurement Bob may always correctly decode Alice's message.

We now show how Holevo's theorem (20) follows as a consequence of the general quantum fluctuation theorem (5). To do this we must appropriately choose initial state, evolution operation, and observables so that the random variable $\langle \Delta a \rangle$ averages to $\chi - I$. In the language of the general fluctuation theorem, let the initial state ρ_0 reside in a composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{M}$. $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E}$ represents the encoding Hilbert space, which Alice prepares and Bob then measures, $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{P}$ is the probe Hilbert space accessible only to Bob, and $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{M}$ is a *message* Hilbert space. Note that $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{M}$ is not a *real*, physically accessible subspace, but rather a mathematical construction denoting the *memory* for the classical information of the message [45]. We have

$$\rho_0 = \sum_j \pi_j \rho_j \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\,, \tag{21}$$

where the states $|j\rangle$, each corresponding to word w_j, form an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{M}$. We see that, with probability π_j, ρ_0 corresponds to the *message state* $|j\rangle$. The measured initial and final observables are

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\mathrm{i}} &= -\sum_j \log(\rho_j) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j| \\ A^{\mathrm{f}} &= -\log(\bar{\rho} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) \otimes \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{M} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k,j} \log\left(\pi_{k|j}/\pi_k\right) \Pi_k \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\,, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $I_{k,j} = \log\left(\pi_{k|j}/\pi_k\right)$. Note that we are not observing the original encoding set up by Alice, but rather its time evolved state after undergoing possibly noisy dynamics in a quantum channel. To apply the fluctuation theorem (5), we start with the output of the noisy channel and perform the two measurements, A^{i} and A^{f}, instantaneously after each other. The TCP map crucial for Eq. (5) is thus the identity map $\mathbb{E}(\rho) = \rho$. A^{i} commutes with ρ_0, so $\rho_\tau = \mathbb{E}_\tau(M^{\mathrm{i}}(\rho_0)) = \rho_0$ and the measurement of A^{f} is carried out on the *same* state. After computing $\langle \Delta a \rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left\{(A^{\mathrm{f}} - A^{\mathrm{i}})\rho_0\right\} = \chi - I$, Eq. (7) becomes

$$\chi - I \geq -\log(\gamma)\,, \tag{23}$$

where the corresponding quantum efficacy is given by

$$\gamma = \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-A^{\mathrm{f}}\right)\rho_0 \exp\left(A^{\mathrm{i}}\right)\right\}\,. \tag{24}$$

Equations (23) and (24) constitute the sharpened Holevo's bound as a consequence of the general quantum fluctuation theorem (5). Indeed, our new bound is tighter than the usual inequality (20), in the sense that the correction term, $-\log(\gamma)$, is always non-negative. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0 \exp\left(A^{\mathrm{i}}\right) &= \sum_j \pi_j \rho_j \exp\left(-\log(\rho_j)\right) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j| \\ &= \sum_j \pi_j \hat{P}_j \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\,, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\hat{P}_j$ is the projector into the support of ρ_j. We can rewrite Eq. (24) with Eq. (25) as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-A^{\mathrm{f}}\right)\rho_0 \exp\left(A^{\mathrm{i}}\right)\right\} \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-A^{\mathrm{f}}\right)\sum_j \pi_j \hat{P}_j \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_j \pi_j\, \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(\log\left(\bar{\rho} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right) + \sum_k I_{k,j}\,\Pi_k\right)\right\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The inequality in Eq. (26) is justified by noting that $\exp\left(\log\left(\bar{\rho} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right) + \sum_k I_{k,j}\,\Pi_k\right)$ is non-negative and $\hat{P}_j \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$ is a projection operator. We now use a statement of the Golden-Thompson inequality [47,48]: for any Hermitian operators A and B, we have $\mathrm{tr}\{\exp(A + B)\} \leq \mathrm{tr}\{\exp(A)\exp(B)\}$. Note that in the present case, A and B are both logarithms of bounded Hermitian operators, and are only bounded from *above*, though the Golden-Thompson inequality still holds [49]. Accordingly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(-A^{\mathrm{f}}\right)\rho_0 \exp\left(A^{\mathrm{i}}\right)\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_j \pi_j\, \mathrm{tr}\left\{\exp\left(\log\left(\bar{\rho} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right)\right) \cdot \exp\left(\sum_k I_{k,j}\,\Pi_k\right)\right\} \\ &= \sum_j \pi_j\, \mathrm{tr}\left\{\left(\bar{\rho} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right) \sum_k \pi_{k|j}/\pi_k\, \Pi_k\right\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

From the definition $\pi_k = \sum_j \pi_j \pi_{k|j}$ we finally obtain

$$\gamma \le \mathrm{tr}\left\{\bar{\rho} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \sum_k \Pi_k \right\} = 1\,, \tag{28}$$

which shows that $-\log(\gamma) \ge 0$, as desired. It is worth mentioning that our derivation does not invoke the strong subadditivity of von Neumann entropy, and thus relies on weaker statements than the ones commonly required to prove Holevo's bound [50].

Concluding remarks. – We developed a general framework for quantum fluctuation theorems by explicitly accounting for the back action of quantum measurements. This enabled us to analyze quantum corrections to classical theorems and derive a new fluctuation theorem for thermal quantum work. Finally, we showed that quantum mechanical formulations of the second law are intimately tied to quantum information theory by deriving Holevo's bound as a consequence of the general quantum fluctuation theorem.

* * *

SD acknowledges financial support by a fellowship within the postdoc-program of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD, contract No D/11/40955). DK acknowledges financial support by a fellowship from the Joint Quantum Institute, a National Science Foundation Physics Frontier Center.

REFERENCES

[1] Clausius R., *Abhandlungen über die mechanische Wärmetheorie*, (Vieweg, Braunschweig, Germany) 1864.
[2] Shannon C. E., *Bell Sys. Tech. J.*, **27** (1948) 379 .
[3] Callen H. B., *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, (Wiley, New York, USA) 1985.
[4] Landauer R., *IBM J. Research and Develop.*, **5** (1961) 183 .
[5] Bérut A., Arakelyan A., Petrosyan A., Ciliberto S., Dillenschneider R., and Lutz E., *Nature*, **483** (2012) 187.
[6] Holevo A. S., *IEEE Trans. Info. Theo.*, **44** (1998) 269.
[7] Monroe C., *Nature*, **416** (2002) 238.
[8] Feynman R., *Int. J. Theo. Phys.*, **21** (1982) 476.
[9] Lloyd S., *Science*, **273** (1996) 1073.
[10] Ekert A. K., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67** (1991) 661.
[11] Grover L. K., *Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, (1996) 212.
[12] Shor P. W., *SIAM Review*, **41** (1999) 303.
[13] Harrow A. W., Hassidim A., and Lloyd S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **103** (2009) 150502.
[14] Kasevich M. and Chu S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67** (1991) 181.
[15] Kimble H. J., Levin Y., Matsko A. B., Thorne K. S., and Vyatchanin S. P., *Phys. Rev. D*, **65** (2001) 022002.
[16] Giovannetti V., Lloyd S. and Maccone L., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **96** (2006) 010401.
[17] Hudson J. J., Kara D. M., Smallman I. J., Sauer B. E., Tarbutt M. R., and Hinds E. A., *Nature*, **473** (2011) 493.
[18] Jarzynski C., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **78** (1997) 2690.
[19] Esposito M. and Van den Broeck C., *EPL (Europhys. Lett.)*, **95** (2011) 40004.
[20] Talkner P., Lutz E., and Hänggi P., *Phys. Rev. E*, **75** (2007) 050102(R).
[21] Campisi M., Hänggi P., and Talkner P., *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **83** (2011) 771.
[22] Vedral V., *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, **45** (2012) 272001.
[23] Williams S. R., Searles D. J., and Evans D. J., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **100** (2008) 250601.
[24] Schumacher B., *Phys. Rev. A*, **54** (1996) 2614.
[25] Sagawa T. and Ueda M., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **104** (2010) 090602.
[26] Sagawa T. and Ueda M., *Phys. Rev. E*, **85** (2012) 021104.
[27] Chandler D., *Introduction to Modern Statistical Mechanics*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK) 1987.
[28] Gelin M. F. and Thoss M., *Phys. Rev. E*, **79** (2009) 051121.
[29] Boksenbojm E., Wynants B., and Jarzynski C., *Physica A*, **389** (2010) 4406.
[30] Campisi M., Talkner P., Hänggi P., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **102** (2009) 210401.
[31] Subşai Y. and Hu B.-L., *Phys. Rev. E***85** (2012) 011112.
[32] Talkner P., Campisi M., and Hänggi P., *J. Stat. Mech.*, (2009) P02025.
[33] Deffner S. and Lutz E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **105** (2010) 170402.
[34] Suzuki M., *J. Math. Phys.*, **26** (1985) 601.
[35] Deffner S. and Lutz E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **107** (2011) 140404.
[36] Jarzynski C. and Wójcik D. K., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **92** (2004) 230602.
[37] Campisi M., Talkner P., and Hänggi P., *Phys. Rev. E*, **83** (2011) 041114.
[38] Morikuni Y. and Tasaki H., *J. Stat. Phys.*, **143** (2011) 1.
[39] Reid J. C., Sevick E. M., and Evans D. J., *EPL (Europhys. Lett.)*, **72** (2005) 726.
[40] Seifert U., arXiv:1205.4176.
[41] To see this, let the partial trace basis diagonalize $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(t)$, from which it follows that the effective Hamiltonian $h^{\mathrm{eff}}(t) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}\left\{\sqrt{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}}(t)}\, h_{\mathcal{SB}} \sqrt{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}}(t)}\right\}$.
[42] Mendl C. and Wolf M., *Com. Math. Phys.*, **289** (2009) 1057.
[43] Seifert U., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **95** (2005) 040602.
[44] Braginsky V. B. and Khalili F. Y., *Quantum Measurement*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK) 1992.
[45] Nielsen M. A. and Chuang I. L., *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK) 2000.
[46] Kullback S., *Information Theory and Statistics*, (Peter Smith, Gloucester, UK) 1978.
[47] Golden S., *Phys. Rev.*, **137** (1965) B1127.
[48] Thompson C. J., *J. Math. Phys.*, **6** (1965) 1812.
[49] Ruskai M. B., *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **26** (1972) 280.
[50] Ruskai M. B., *J. Math. Phys.*, **9** (2002) 4358.